

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

QUASIM BOLLING
Plaintiff

v

GREGORY KLIMASZEWSKI #6531
And
LAWRENCE WILLEMS #7394
Defendants

CASE # 14-CV-1574

THE HONORABLE JUDGE
JOHN Z LEE
(PRESIDING)

FILED

MAY 14 2018

THOMAS G. BRUTON
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

MOTION FOR FINAL JUDGEMENT
IN CASE #
14-CV-1574

Now comes the (Plaintiff) Pro-se-Litigant and
petitioner, MR. QUASIM BOLLING, And Respectfully
moves this Honorable Court and petition a final
Call, order, or judgement In the above mentioned
case. Until Docket 231 arose the plaintiff had
no reason to petition A motion for final judgement.

That's usually the Defendants Approach Due to
A lack of Evidence on the plaintiffs Approach to
the Civil Case. . . . However

After the plaintiff RECEIVED notification that SARA MAEY McDONALD would be Resigning from the Case of Bolling v. Klimaszewski, He had NO other Choice but to file for this particular motion and the plaintiff MR. Bolling States these facts for Appellate Review.

1. MS Wong was the 1st Attorney Representing the Defendants Klimaszewski And WILLEMS. When she filed for a LEAVE to Withdraw, MS M^E Donald Relieved MS Sheri Wong. Then pursuant to MS Wong withdrawing M^S McDONALD withdrew Approximately nine months ago And MR Bret Kabanowski Stepped in And that who the plaintiff Pro-se-ligant MR. Bolling Have been Attempting to Converse, Communicate, and file motions with for the Last several months will have accurate times upon Appearance for this Motion.

Then upon the Pro-se ligant plaintiff of wrong doings throughout the Civil and Criminal proceeding MR. BOLLING, Receives A letter from MS McDONALD Stating that She is withdrawing from Case # 14-cv-1574. Shortly after MR. Bolling requested a Standing order Settlement Conference with the Defendants. JUDGE LEE Denied the Motion Due to the fact that the Plaintiff had failed to Converse with MR. Kabanowski NOT MS McDONALD. So upon visiting 30 North LaSalle Suite 900 the plaintiff was made Aware that there were more than one Defense Attorney on Case # 14-cv-1574.

In which I the plaintiff found more than Awkward. Then I the plaintiff always understood that officers Klimaszewski #6531 And Lawrence Williams #7394 NEVER ONCE made a Clean Stop nor is there any Evidence of Narcotics. Upon Mr Bolling not being aware of the Law, nor his Civil Rights, as a Citizen of the U.S.A, his own Defense Counsel at the Stage in Criminal proceedings used his own testimony in Return to win his Criminal Charge. And Collect a Sum of \$2500 And a Agreement with the State to not be held responsible for the officers unprofessional Improper forceful Conduct. Upon Being made aware Mr Bolling filed a Complaint even after he regained his freedom against his Defense Attorney in the Criminal Case. He filed with the A.R.D.C of Misconduct and illegal advice from Counsel in which the A.R.D.C are waiting for the outcome of the present Case At hand.

For Appellate Review And Supreme Court
As A PRO-SE LITIGANT I FEEL AS FOLLOW.

1. THE ARRESTING OFFICERS VIOLATED MY CIVIL RIGHTS BY ME WALKING DOWN THE STREETS IN MY LIVING AREA. USING PHYSICAL FORCE AS A EMERGENCY TAKE DOWN AND MAKING ME ADMIT TO SOMETHING I NEVER HAD I WAS SCARED FOR MY LIFE WHEN THEY ABRUPTLY THREW ME TO THE GROUND.

In Civil Action no 1:08-cv-3172 JHC Although this is a case for Pursuant to Local Rule 56.1 (B)(2) Plaintiff respectfully submit the following Responses to Defendants undisputed facts 1. Pursuant to L.R. 56.1 (B)(2)(a)(2)(iii) Plaintiff dispute defendant's contention that since 2005 Secretary of State has removed at least 25 individuals from the list of eligible voters because they were not US Citizens. Defendants Exhibit 1 the cited record source reports list only 17 individuals as non Citizens.

In *Bollino v. Klimaszewski* the Defendants make more than one accusations of recovered narcotics. However the August report states a specific amount. There is no actual report of the testing of the illegal narcotics signatures E.T.C. Now the State lost their case on these specific findings and petitions a summary judgement in which the plaintiff is willfully agreeing to a summary judgement only if the proper information was given as in the mentioned case above.

The plaintiff states for the record, Although the first case cited is different a narcotic case, And a citizen case. The results are still the same, If there is no evidence to challenge then there should be no case. As a pro-se litigant. Mr. Bollino states that in his civil case, that the defendants have used the proceeds, and protocol for the federal civil and procedure to their advantage.

and have left Case Statute open, for months in which the defense should have filed for a trial or jury trial in which to terminate the case.

Now as for Mrs McDonald's filing for withdrawal yes the plaintiff wishes to know was that in the Rms of Case # 14-cv-1574. There would be some kind of violations due to the fact that the plaintiff has been associating w/ a phantom Attorney, which is another fact in the judicial system against pro-se litigants.

The plaintiff is petitioning motion to dismiss with prejudice due to the fact that the defendants have been using their professionalism, as Attorneys of law to Embarrassor Intimidate further use to stop a United State Citizens to enforce the Constitution of the United States of America for Quasim Bolling

Rule 4.3: Dealing with Unrepresented person

In dealing on behalf of a client with a person who is not represented by counsel, a lawyer shall not state or imply that the lawyer is disinterested. When the lawyer knows or reasonably should know that the unrepresented person misunderstands the lawyer's role in the matter, the lawyer shall not give legal advice to an unrepresented person other than the advice to secure counsel if the lawyer knows or reasonably should know that the interest

HOWEVER, for the last SEVERAL months the plaintiff Quasim Bolling has been visiting petitioning And filing motions to MR. Bret Kabanowski. Is to the fact that Mrs McDonald had withdrew her position as the Defendants Counsel back in the year 2017, Right after Mrs Sheri Wong withdrew as Attorney for the Defendants Gregory Kinaszewski and Lawrence Wille Both Employed by the City of Chicago Police Dept.

Now the plaintiff Quasim Bolling has worked diligently with the Appropriate Attorney for the Defense As it was bought down to him from the District Courts. The plaintiff says that all of his Information and work have been destroyed or Lost due to the Changes, withdrawals and motions to Leave by the Defendants Representation. The plaintiff move the Honorable Courts only for Appellant Review to Investigate further of the Defendants Accusations of Illegal drug. It is plan to visualize that the plaintiff Civil Rights has been violated all through the Criminal proceeding. As well As his Civil Rights. In the plaintiff Criminal proceeding in which was won only to the motion of Client Attorney Relationship. In which the plaintiff was told by his hired Attorney to Admit to something that was not ever found for his freedom. In which was sold at \$25,000 to walk from the Penal Institution.

And Now At this point for APPELLATE REVIEW the plaintiff IS ASKING At this Level A THROUGH REVIEW FROM THE HONORABLE JUDGE JOHN Z. LEE And Set for A STANDING ORDER SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE which was suggested by ATTORNEY MR. BRET KABANCINSKI WHO WAS SAID TO BE the DEFENSE REPRESENTATION. MR. MARY McDONALD HAS WITHDREW from Case # 14-CV-1574. In which there WERE ANY motions or petitions Filed to HER

In which this should be illegal for the States Attorney to File A withdrawal if she NEVER WAS ON the Case for the PRO-SE litigant. It WAS done to EXTEND time for MR. KABACINSKI to file his Final motion The plaintiff request A full Review BEFORE STATING Another Constitutional Violation OR Explain the previous motion.

Of such a person are or have a reasonable possibility of being in conflict with the interest of the Client

This is in fact what the Defense have been doing to the plaintiff Pro-se litigant Quasim Bolling. We would further go into a Second Chapter of this motion for final judgement due to the fact that appearance is necessary. Thank you for your cooperation and may the Court find justice and favor in the plaintiff Quasim Bolling for the unfairness in this civil procedure.

Quasim Bolling
Respectfully Submitted
Quasim Bolling

5-14-18